

DD/5-36-214

31 May 1956

MEMORANDUM FOR: Colonel White

SUBJECT : Contracting of Consultants for the Agency's Assessment and Evaluation Program

1. You had requested that I check into the recent cases in which the Office of Training had processed requests for the contracting of consultants for the Assessment and Evaluation Program, to see generally how many cases were involved, the points at which delays in processing have occurred and the reasons for the delays. The facts developed during the course of my review are outlined below and in the tabs attached.

25X1A9a

2. The problem was discussed with [REDACTED] inasmuch as it was in his office that the requests originated. He was helpful in clarifying the problem since his concern was directed to the length of time it has taken to process requests for DCI approval submitted since 21 July 1953, when the basic paper setting up the Consultant Program was approved by the Director. He was not concerned about the length of time it has taken to complete the hiring of a consultant after approval had been received from the DCI.

25X1A9a

3. In 1953 [REDACTED] submitted a basic paper containing thirteen names, three of which had been cleared and were available for service, one of which had previously been submitted, and nine of which were new recommendations. This paper was submitted in conformance with a recommendation made by the Inspector General after a review of the problems affecting the Assessment and Evaluation Staff. It was initiated by [REDACTED] on 16 July 1953, signed by Mr. Baird on 16 July and approved by the Director on 21 July 1953. Subsequently, four of the nine prospective consultants have been employed. Five of them were not able to be employed for various reasons, including failure to receive appropriate security clearance, or reluctance on their part to render service to the Agency.

25X1A9a

4. It is in the processing of requests to contract substitutes for the names on the original list that [REDACTED] has run into his "problems." He has initiated, since 1953, requests for approval for five individuals:

On 4 March 1954,
On 15 September 1954
On 17 January 1955
On 17 January 1955
On 12 January 1956

25X1A5a1

5. The time taken for processing each case is outlined below:

25X1A5a1

a. The request concerning [REDACTED] was approved on 17 March 1954, taking ten working days from the time of initiation to the time of final approval.

25X1A5a1

b. The request concerning [REDACTED] was approved on 4 October 1954, after fourteen working days, four of which were used within the Office of Training, three days were spent in the Office of Personnel for comments as requested by the DCI, two days were spent in transit, and five days were spent in the Office of the Director prior to signature.

25X1A5a1

c. The request concerning [REDACTED] was approved 3 February 1955, after fourteen working days. The routing sheets are no longer part of the file, so it is not possible to determine what happened within the Office of Personnel and between the Offices of Training and Personnel for the ten working days between 17 January and 1 February. It would appear that it probably took one day for delivery from the Office of Training to the Office of Personnel, which would leave nine days within Personnel to make the checks required by Regulation as to:

(1) Whether there were any other consultants of similar qualifications who could be used for the type of activity proposed, and

(2) Whether or not the professional qualifications of the proposed consultant were such as to justify the Director of Personnel recommending payment at the rate of \$50 per day.

25X1A5a1

The time here may have been a little longer than in previous cases, due to the fact that the name of [REDACTED] was also included in the memorandum with [REDACTED] so that the checks mentioned above were probably made on both proposed consultants during this period of time.

25X1A5a1

d. The request concerning [REDACTED] was included in the same memorandum with [REDACTED] and the processing was as outlined in c. above.

25X1A5a1

e. The request concerning [REDACTED] was approved on 1 March 1956, after thirty-six working days, twenty-three of which were spent in the Office of Training, six of which were spent in the Office of Personnel, four in transit, two in the Office of the Deputy Director (Support) (two different times), and one in the Office of the Deputy Director.

The reason for a nine-day initial delay was not evident in the file because no routing sheets remain - only the basic documents. Between 26 January and 9 February (based on [REDACTED] K1A9a recollection, since the routing sheets have been destroyed) there were one or two exchanges of the documents between the Offices of Personnel and Training, since the memorandum was not in the proper format (concerns, etc.) when received in the Office of Personnel. A log in the Office of Training indicates that the memorandum, in proper form, was forwarded finally to the Office of Personnel for its action on 9 February 1956. After being put into the proper form, it appears that the request received the normal pattern of processing within the Office of Personnel, since only six working days were then used for processing prior to being approved by [REDACTED] on 20 February 1956.

25X1A9a

The reason for an additional day's transit time and three extra days in the Office of Training results from the fact that on 5 February [REDACTED] submitted instructions to all Deputies that papers submitted to the Director's Office would, in the future, in the opening paragraph indicate whether the paper required approval, whether it was only for information, etc., etc. Inasmuch as the paper on [REDACTED] had been started in January, prior to the instructions from [REDACTED] it obviously did not comply. It was returned to the Office of Training from the Office of the Deputy Director (Support), with the request that the first page be redone in a manner acceptable to the Director's Office.

25X1A5a1

It seems evident from the above that in only one instance was there a considerable time lag between initiation and approval, and that is in the case of [REDACTED]. The delay in this case resulted from action, or lack thereof, within the Office of Training itself, and only sixteen working days were required outside the Office of Training after the request was placed into proper form. Periods of sixteen working days for one case, fourteen working days for three cases, and ten working days for one case do not appear to constitute excessive time for processing cases of this sort.

25X1A5a1

6. Concern about the length of time it takes to secure the Director's approval appears to be misplaced, inasmuch as it has generally taken weeks, and, in the case of [REDACTED] it took almost a year, (after DDCI approval) before the personal history statements have been submitted so that final processing could be completed.

25X1A5a1

7. According to the reports prepared by the Office of Personnel through the first quarter of 1956 - of the five consultants processed to date, only [REDACTED] had been used. Six of the consultants on the original list approved 21 July 1953 were used for a total of 75 days during FY 1955 (TAB 7).

25X1A9a

3. [REDACTED] questioned the basis for requiring that a personal history statement be completed by a prospective consultant and forwarded to the Office of Training at the time approval to contract him was being sought from the Director [REDACTED] para. 3.a.(1). He feels that it is not proper to require the high level people with whom he proposes to do business to complete a lengthy personal history statement and then have nothing come of it if the Director's approval is not received. This would be embarrassing, both to him and to the proposed consultant. He much prefers to have approval of the Director before he approaches the prospective consultant. The experience to date with the

25X1A

25X1A5a1

five prospective consultants processed since 1953 does not appear to substantiate the existence of a situation which would warrant a revision of the Regulation. The contracting of [REDACTED] was approved on 17 March 1954 and the personal history statement submitted on 12 May 1954. In the

25X1A5a1

case of Dr. [REDACTED], he was approved for contracting on 4 October 1954; however, the personal history statement was not signed until 26 February 1955 and was not forwarded to the Office of Personnel until 19 January 1956. The Deputy Director approved the contracting of [REDACTED]

25X1A5a1

on 3 February 1955, and the personal history statement was signed on 12 March 1955 and submitted to the Office of Personnel on 22 March 1955.

25X1A5a1

[REDACTED] was approved for contracting on 3 February 1955 but has never been asked to submit a personal history statement because of the fact that he was cleared for use by the Medical Staff and the Office of Training has therefore not completed arrangements with him. The contracting of [REDACTED]

25X1A5a1

[REDACTED] was approved by the Deputy Director on 1 March 1956, and a personal history statement has not as yet been received from him. In two cases, then, the personal history statements were returned fairly promptly, in two cases there was a considerable delay, and in one case the personal history statement will not be forthcoming because of the use being made of the proposed consultant by another element of the Agency. If the provisions of the current Regulation are followed, papers would not be processed within the Agency until a prospective consultant had indicated (by filing a personal history statement) a willingness to serve, if so requested. It was apparently believed, at the time the Regulation was processed, that it would be desirable to have this determination prior to seeking the approval of the Director, and there appears to be enough of a delay or question of ultimate employment in three out of the five cases processed to date to warrant continuation of this provision in the Regulation. (All of the requests, except that for [REDACTED] were processed prior to the effective date of the Regulation which is 17 May 1955. I have not been able to determine why the request for [REDACTED] was processed without the personal history statement, as required by the Regulation.)

25X1A5a1

25X1A5a1

[REDACTED] also questioned "Why it takes three or four weeks for the Office of Personnel to decide whether to pay a man \$35 or \$50 per day." As outlined in paragraph 5. above, for those cases in which time in the Office of Personnel was determinable, action was completed by that office within periods of three, six and nine working days. (The nine days

25X1A9a

9. [REDACTED] also questioned "Why it takes three or four weeks for the Office of Personnel to decide whether to pay a man \$35 or \$50 per day." As outlined in paragraph 5. above, for those cases in which time in the Office of Personnel was determinable, action was completed by that office within periods of three, six and nine working days. (The nine days

were required to process a paper containing the names of two proposed consultants.) In this connection it ought to be pointed out that two distinct evaluations take place within the Office of Personnel (as required by the Regulation) after a request is received:

a. The Personnel Evaluation Division reviews the type of service to be performed, to determine the approximate grade level of responsibility at which the consultant will be operating. If he is to sit on a panel, the information on what the panel is doing or supposed to be doing is also reviewed prior to the establishment of the amount of compensation.

b. The Personnel Assignment Division must check out the roster of consultants already on board to see whether the Agency already "has a staff employee, consultant, or an expert qualified to meet the new requirements." The qualifications of the individual proposed are also checked out with professional registers or other sources to determine if he apparently has the qualifications which meet the requirements of the position.

25X1A9a

10. On the basis of the above review, as a practical matter it appears that [REDACTED] has no real problem, inasmuch as (a) the average time necessary to process a request for the Director's approval does not appear to be excessive, and (b) urgency has not been indicated in the processing of documents subsequent to the Director's approval.

1000

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Special Assistant to the
Deputy Director (Support)

Attachments:
TABS A through F

SA-DD/S:RBS:mrp

Distribution:

Orig & lcc - DTR
1 - D/Pers
1 - DD/S chrono
1 - DD/S subject
✓1 - DD/S reading